NO. 628

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CUSTOMER NO. 60533

P. 10

AUG 2 9 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10, 12-14, 16, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Pat. No. 5,272,628 ("Koss") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0042859 ("Lowry"). Final Office Action, p. 3. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koss in view of Lowry in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0083016 ("Dittrich"). Final Office Action, p. 8. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koss in view of Lowry in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0149934 ("Worden"). Final Office Action, p. 8. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koss in view of Lowry in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,396,587 ("Reed"). Final Office Action, p. 9. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Koss in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0061193 ("Anson"). Final Office Action, p. 9. Applicants respectfully traverse each rejection. Applicants submit that the asserted combination fails to teach or suggest each of the elements recited in the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites "appending information identifying sources of portions of data to said at least one final report spreadsheet." Independent claims 10 and 12 recite "appending information identifying sources of said desired portions of data to said at least one final report spreadsheet." None of the cited references, including Koss, Lowry, Dittrich, Worden, Reed and Anson, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Koss discloses aggregating one or more source tables into a single destination table by selecting data from source tables and mapping the tables to a destination table. See Koss, Abstract. However, Koss does not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Lowry discloses opening a plurality of original data files, fragmenting said original data files into fragments, and interspersing said fragments among each other forming composite files (privacy protected files). Lowry, Abstract. However, Lowry does not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Dittrich discloses a method of processing a transaction over a network, including generating a listing associated with a first user and a good or service and conducting a first transaction associated with the listing in response to a selection of a second user. Dittrich, Abstract. However, Dittrich does not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Worden discloses using a set of mappings between XML logical structures and business information model logical structures, in which the mappings describe how a document in a given XML based language conveys information in a business information model. Worden, Abstract. However, Worden does not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Reed discloses generating a representation of a desired screen image, periodically updating a display system to display the desired screen image that corresponds to the state of the representation existing at the time of the update, and changing the representation so as to record the cumulative effect of a plurality of successive changes that are made to the desired screen image since the last update of the display system. Reed, Abstract. However, Reed does not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Anson discloses generating a focused data set by filtering a data set. The focused data set may include a contextual view, where additional lines of data that are related to the lines of interest are also displayed to the user. Anson, Abstract. However, Anson does not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet.

Since the cited references do not disclose appending information identifying sources of portions of data to a final report spreadsheet, at least one feature of claim 1 is not disclosed by the references. Claim 1 is therefore allowable and claims 2-4, 6-8 and 21 are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. Additionally, at least one feature of claim 10 is not disclosed by the references. Claim 10 is therefore allowable, as is claim 22, which depends from claim 10. Likewise, at least one feature of claim 12 is not disclosed by the references. Therefore, claim 12 is allowable, and claims 13, 14, and 16-20, which depend from claim 12, are also allowable.

In addition to the reasons discussed above, many of the dependent claims are separately patentable. For example, none of the references disclose or suggest storing a custom search, wherein the custom search enables execution of a predetermined search of one or more selected spreadsheets, as recited in claim 9. Also, none of the references disclose or suggest a select all open workbooks selection, as recited in claim 14. Additionally, none of the references disclose or suggest an event logger for tracking generation of at least one final report spreadsheet and reporting said tracking to a user during generation of said at least one final report spreadsheet, as recited in claim 19. None of the references disclose or suggest a custom search, wherein the custom search enables execution of a predetermined search without selection of portions of data to be searched, as recited in claim 21. Further, none of the references disclose or suggest a custom search development procedure to allow a user to define and store custom searches for use by said custom search procedure, as recited in claim 22.

Any changes to the claims in this amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon cited references, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto. Applicants' failure to challenge any cited reference as prior art should not be construed as an admission by Applicants that the unchallenged reference does constitute prior art.

TOLER SCHAFFER

PECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CUSTOMER NO. 60533

NO. 628

P. 13

AUG 2 9 2006 CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney or agent.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

8-25-2006

Date

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey G. Toler; Reg. No. 38,342

Attorney for Applicants

TOLER SCHAFFER, L.L.P. 5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 327-5515 (phone)

(512) 327-5575 (fax)